REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4 are again submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art for the reasons set forth hereafter. No new matter is involved.

Beginning on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,434,096 of Akagi et al. in view of US Patent 7,046,600 of Matsumoto. This rejection is again respectfully traversed.

According to paragraph 1 in the lower portion of page 2 of the Office Action, Matsumoto is relied upon as disclosing the use of a maximum beta value obtained from a reproduction signal. Akagi et al., on the other hand, is relied upon as disclosing setting an offset value supplied to a tilt adjustment coil. And as further stated in paragraph 2 at the top of page 3 of the Office Action, Akagi et al. disclose, by way of Figure 17 and Elements 318, 320, 312, 313 and 403 as well as in the discussion at lines 8-18 of column 35, that the current supply to a tilt adjustment coil (Element 403 in Fig. 17) is based on an offset adjustment signal (Elements 318, 320 and 312 of Fig. 17). In view of this, Akagi et al. is said to disclose performing control of a current supplied to a tilt adjustment coil based on the offset adjustment signal. As still further stated in paragraph 3 in the lower portion of page 3 of the Office Action, it would have been obvious to combine the disclosed teachings of Matsumoto and Akagi so as to arrive at the claimed subject matter. It is again stated that Akagi et al. discloses problems that arise from optical pickup defects, and that all of the problems listed result in poor recording quality. Matsumoto is said to disclose the use of a setting of a driving signal level based on a maximum beta value (lines 1-4 of column 11, Element 24 of Figure 5, and Figure 3). Fig. 3 is said to show that there is a decrease in error value with a maximum beta value, such that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have

been motivated to combine the teachings of Akagi et al. and those of Matsumoto because Matsumoto discloses reducing error value, and that in turn increases recording efficiency which helps improve the deficiencies disclosed by Akagi et al.

Claims 1-4 are again submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art. Features in accordance with the present invention include (1) recording an offset adjustment signal in a test recording area provided on an optical disc, wherein the offset adjustment signal is recorded while modifying a driving signal lever supplied to the tilt adjustment coil, and (2) playing back an RF signal of the offset adjustment signal that was recorded to the optical disc.

According to the Office Action, such features are disclosed at lines 40-42 of column 12 of Akagi. However, this portion of Akagi is "The offset amount of the tilt error signal depending on the movement direction of the optical pickup is stored beforehand, the above-mentioned stored offset is read". Moreover, according to Fig. 17 of Akagi, offset detection circuit 318 detects offset based on a signal from tilt sensor 310 and the detected offset value is stored in a memory circuit 319. An offset correction circuit 320 corrects tilt adjustment corrects the tilt adjustment signal.

Thus, Akagi does not show or suggest the features (1) and (2) in accordance with the invention which are noted above. Moreover, Matsumoto only shows features concerning beta value and does not show the features (1) and (2).

Claim 1 in its present form defines a tilt control method which includes "recording an offset adjustment signal in a test recording area provided on an optical disc, wherein said offset adjustment signal is recorded while modifying a driving signal level supplied to said tilt adjustment coil" and "playing back an RF signal of said offset adjustment signal that was recorded on the optical disc".

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art. Claim 2 depends from and contains all of the limitations of claim 1 so as to also distinguish patentably over the art.

Claim 3 defines a tilt control apparatus which includes the features of the present invention so as to distinguish patentably over the art. Claim 4 depends from and contains all of the limitations of claim 3 so as to also distinguish patentably over the prior art.

In conclusion, claims 1-4 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the cited references for the reasons described above. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4764 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: December 4, 2006

By: _____
John P. Scherlacher
Registration No. 23,009
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601